

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 21-22 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 8 and 11-12

The Office Action has rejected each of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shrader et al. (U.S. patent 6,374,359) hereafter "Shrader" in further view of Rail (U.S. published application 2003/0110399) hereafter "Rail", Serbinis et al. (US Patent 6,314,425) hereafter "Serbinis" and Garrison (US Patent 6,275,939) hereafter "Garrison."

The combination fails to disclose, teach, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make or use all the elements of claim 1. As is noted in the office action, the combination of Shrader and Rail fail to specify computing an expiration timestamp for the session and combining the message digest and expiration timestamp. The combination with Serbinis fails to provide disclosure or motivation for at least "combining the message digest and expiration timestamp." Claim 1 includes "computing a message digest of the user ID," hence the message digest is based on user identification information. In Serbinis, the access token is described as follows at column 20, lines 58-63

As heretofore stated, an access token of the present invention is comprised of a signed string unique to a transaction and generated from one or more random numbers independent of any user information or resource information or any other identifiable information.

Although access tokens Serbinis states it is an object of its invention, to use access tokens to control a user's access to services by a document management system (See column 3, lines 50-53), the required independence of an access token of user or resource information does not provide the disclosure missing from the other references for combining a message digest, which is computed of the user ID, and an expiration timestamp. Moreover, Serbinis emphasis on the

access token being independent of user and resource information would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine with Shrader and Rail or Garrison to make the invention as claimed in claim 1 as it suggests a security mechanism independent of a message digest of the user ID. Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Shrader in view of Rail, Serbinis and Garrison.

In addition to claims 2, 4, 8 and 11-12, claims 3, 5-7, 9-10, and 13-16 also depend from claim 1 and were rejected under the same combination of references plus others cited for support of their additional features. The arguments with respect to claim 1 stand to illustrate that its dependent claims 2-16 are also non-obvious over the cited art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 17-20

The Office Action has rejected each of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shrader in further view of Rail, Serbinis, and Garrison. The arguments with respect to independent claim 1 are applicable to independent claim 17 as well which includes “logic configured to combine the message digest with expiration timestamp.” Claim 17 is patentable over the combination of Shrader in view of Rail, Serbinis and Garrison.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17, and the arguments with respect to claim 1 are applicable to them as well. Claims 18-20 are patentable over the combination of Shrader in view of Rail, Serbinis and Garrison as well.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 21 and 23-24

The Office Action has rejected each of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shrader in further view of Rail and Garrison. Claim 22 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shrader in further view of Rail, Serbinis and Garrison as it was noted Shrader, Rail and Garrison failed to teach “concatenating the message

digest with an expiration timestamp." Claim 21 has been amended to include "concatenating the message digest with an expiration timestamp." Therefore, the arguments with respect to independent claim 1 are applicable to independent claim 21 as well.

In addition to claims 22-24, claims 25-28 also depend from claim 21 as amended and were rejected under the same combination of references plus others cited for support of their additional features. The arguments with respect to claim 21 stand to illustrate that its dependent claims 22-28 are also non-obvious over the cited art.

Conclusion

In light of the amendments and remarks presented above, pending claims 1-28 as amended are in condition for allowance, and applicant respectfully request a notice of allowance.

Date: 8/15/06

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of Applicant
Teddy Christian Johnson



Eileen Lehmann
Registration No. 39,272
Hewlett-Packard Company
Mail Stop 1197
1501 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
650-857-7940 (telephone)
650-852-8063 (fax)